



INVESTOR IN PEOPLE

Hitachi, Ltd.  
% Mewburn Ellis  
York House  
23 Kingsway  
LONDON  
WC2B 6HP

**The Patent Office  
Patents Directorate**

Concept House  
Cardiff Road, Newport  
South Wales NP10 8QQ

Examiner: 01633 813755  
†E-mail: [william.riggs@patent.gov.uk](mailto:william.riggs@patent.gov.uk)  
Switchboard: 01633 814000  
Fax: 01633 814444  
Minicom: 08459 222250  
DX 722540/41 Cleppa Park 3  
<http://www.patent.gov.uk>

**Your Reference:** TRC/FP6162978  
**Application No:** GB 0316527.1

30 January 2004

Dear Sirs

**Patents Act 1977:  
Combined Search and Examination Report under Sections 17 and 18(3)**

**Latest date for reply:** 18 April 2005

I enclose two copies of my search and examination report and two copies of the citations.

By the above date you should either file amendments to meet the objections in the report or make observations on them. If you do not, the application may be refused.

**Publication**

I estimate that, provided you have met all the formal requirements, preparations for publication of your application will be completed soon after **7 September 2004**. At this time you will receive a letter confirming the exact date when the preparations for publication will be completed. This letter will also tell you the publication number and date of publication of your application.

**Withdrawal/amendment**

If you wish to withdraw your application before it is published you must do so before the preparations for publication are complete. **WARNING** - after preparations for publication are complete it will NOT be possible to withdraw your application from publication.

---

†Use of E-mail: Please note that e-mail should be used for correspondence only.



INVESTOR IN PEOPLE

Application No: GB 0316527.1

Page 2

30 January 2004

If you wish to file amended claims for inclusion with the published application you must do so before the preparations for publication are completed. If you write to the Office less than 3 weeks before 7 September 2004 please mark your letter prominently:

**"URGENT - PUBLICATION IMMINENT".**

Yours faithfully

Bill Riggs  
Examiner

**Important information about combined search and examination**

I also ask that you take note of the following points. These might have a bearing on the future stages of your application because the examination report has been sent to you before your application has been published.

- (a) You may file voluntary amendments before making a full response to my examination report. We will publish with your application any new or amended claims you file voluntarily or as a full response, provided that they are received before preparations for publication are completed. It would help us when you file amendments before publication if you could **prominently indicate** in a covering letter whether or not the amendments are intended as a full response to the examination report.
- (b) If you file a full response to the examination report before your application is published I will consider it as soon as possible. However, if this would disrupt the publication of your application, I would have to delay taking any action until the application had been published. This delay could be up to 3 months, depending upon when we receive your response.
- (c) There is another situation when there might be a delay between you filing a full response and the Patent Office responding to it. This would arise if you met all my objections but your application had not or had only recently been published. I could not report the outcome of my re-examination until I was satisfied that the search was complete for documents published before the priority date of your invention and that anybody interested in the application has had three months following publication of the application to make observations on the patentability of your invention.
- (d) Provided that the requirements of the Act have been met, I can send your application to grant as early as three months after publication. Before doing so I will bring the original search up to date and raise with you any further objection that might result from this top-up search. However, there is a possibility that at that time I may not have access to all the patent applications published after the priority date of your invention and of possible relevance to your application. If this is the case I would have to complete the search after grant and if necessary raise any new found novelty objection then.



INVESTOR IN PEOPLE

**Application No:** GB 0316527.1  
**Claims searched:** 1 - 20

**Examiner:** Bill Riggs  
**Date of search:** 29 January 2004

## Patents Act 1977 : Search Report under Section 17

### Documents considered to be relevant:

Category	Relevant to claims	Identity of document and passage or figure of particular relevance
A		GB 2375245 A (Sanyo Electric Co) see whole document
A		GB 2345598 A (Samsung Electronics Co) see whole document

### Categories:

X	Document indicating lack of novelty or inventive step	A	Document indicating technological background and/or state of the art.
Y	Document indicating lack of inventive step if combined with one or more other documents of same category.	P	Document published on or after the declared priority date but before the filing date of this invention.
&	Member of the same patent family	E	Patent document published on or after, but with priority date earlier than, the filing date of this application.

### Field of Search:

Search of GB, EP, WO & US patent documents classified in the following areas of the UKC<sup>w</sup>:

H3Q

Worldwide search of patent documents, classified in the following areas of the IPC<sup>7</sup>:

H03J

The following online and other databases have been used in the preparation of this search report :

Online databases: EPODOC, JAPIO, OPTICS, WPI



INVESTOR IN PEOPLE

Your ref: TRC/FP6162978  
Application No: GB 0316527.1  
Applicant: Hitachi, Ltd.

Examiner: Bill Riggs  
Tel: 01633 813755  
Date of report: 30 January 2004

Latest date for reply: 18 April 2005

Page 1/3

## Patents Act 1977

### Combined Search and Examination Report under Sections 17 & 18(3)

#### Clarity and support

1. The channel set-up method of the invention appears to be a two-stage process. In the first stage, the apparatus steps up through all the physical channels and registers information about those channels which contain broadcast signals. In the second stage, the apparatus steps up through only those channels which have not been registered as containing broadcast signals, leading to a faster search. Independent claim 16 reflects the two-stage process. However, claim 1 (lines 10 - 15) requires (a?) setup operation in which channels are scanned and broadcast information is stored. The claim continues 'wherein the setter skips channels having broadcast signals the existence of which is stored in memory during scanning in *the channel set-up operation*'. The wording of this passage does not appear to be quite correct; the claim appears to refer to a single scan, although it is then unclear how the information is initially stored. Amendment is necessary to improve clarity and to ensure support, and to ensure unity of invention with claim 16.

2. Claim 2 requires a 'channel up-down tuner'. In itself, this term is not really unclear, although there is no apparent practical difference between an 'up-down tuner' and simply 'a tuner'. However, the meaning of 'up-down' could be open to doubt later in the claim, which says 'when the channel is up-down tuned successively'. This could refer to both up and down directions of scanning, but the flowcharts (figs. 1 & 7) appear to show that, when tuning, the physical channel number starts at minimum (S102) and is always incremented (S112) until a maximum is reached (S111). Similar considerations apply to independent claim 16. Amendment therefore appears necessary to ensure clarity, and to ensure that claims 2 and 16 are properly supported.

*Note: the expression 'up-down tuning' also occurs on p.14 and elsewhere; also, p.16 says (ln.18) 'when the channel is to be up'. Revision appears necessary.*

3. Similarly, the reference in claim 16 to channels being 'continuously' scanned is not entirely clear. General revision of all such terms appears desirable, to ensure that they are clear and that claims are supported by the description.

*Note: the second part of claim 16, which requires a second step in which channels are scanned 'with skipping channels stored...' (skipping those channels previously stored?) could also benefit from textual revision.*

4. A program condition is described on page 14 ll.12-13, which says 'the execution history value of a number larger than 1 is obtained'. This should apparently be a value of



INVESTOR IN PEOPLE

Your ref: TRC/FP6162978  
Application No: GB 0316527.1

Date of Report: 30 January 2004  
Page 2/3

[ Examination Report contd. ]

1 or larger. (See preceding description and S201, fig.1)

5. At page 24 line 3, a sentence begins 'If the *judgement information* is judged to exist..'. This appears to be incorrect; the passage from p.23 line 14 to p.24 seems to relate to whether a *broadcast signal* or *channel* is judged to exist.

6. Claims 10, 11 and 12 refer to the 'variable accuracy' of the detector. The use of the term 'accuracy' is not clear. The text (p.19 ll.15 - 25) which is perhaps intended to support these claims indicates that the period of time allowed for channel detection may be increased in successive channel scans, so that the chance of missed detection is reduced. Amendment is necessary. Furthermore, claims 11 and 12 appear to be constructed in a way that claims a property of the detector as an outcome of the detection conditions; claims of this form are not generally allowable. (MPP 14.120 refers.) Amendment is necessary.

7. Claim 1 requires a 'channel setupper'. Although unusual, this term is not really unclear, however an alternative expression such as 'means to carry out a channel set-up', or the like, (or even a channel 'stepper' in view of its function of scanning and skipping channels) may be considered preferable. In general, the specification should be revised throughout for any other unusual terms or constructions, and alternatives should be used where any lack of clarity (such as that identified in paragraph 2 above) could result.

#### Other

8. Page 3 line 8 refers to a small LCD TV 'of, for example, five inches'. MPP 14.56 requires the use of metric units, but adds that there is 'no objection to non-standard units used in a statement of prior art by way of direct quotation'. An appropriate amendment of the phrase would appear desirable.

*Note: although 5" equals 12.7 cm exactly, an alternative formulation of the example may be more appropriate here.*

9. The following typographical and similar points have been noticed:

p.1 ln.12: setout (setup?)

p.1 ln.13: at (a)

p.2 ll.19 & 21 and elsewhere: potable (portable)

p.4 ln.4 & p.7 ln.19: multiplied (multiplexed?)



INVESTOR IN PEOPLE

Your ref: TRC/FP6162978  
Application No: GB 0316527.1

Date of Report: 30 January 2004  
Page 3/3

[ Examination Report contd. ]

p.7 ln.1: (as / that?) fall within the (ambit)

p.11 ln.19, fig.2 & elsewhere: flush memory (flash?)

p.27 ln.7, 11 & 21 (claims 5, 6, 9) : number of channel set-up (operations) (plural?)  
(Note: plurals (-s ending) should be checked throughout the specification.)

p.27 ln.15 (claim 7, appendant to cl.1): 'the' digital broadcast signal (a)

p.27 ln.17 (claim 8) in standby state (into a standby state)

p.28 ln.22 & 24 (claim 15) an OSD (an OSD generator)  
(OSD generator 8 generates signals to produce an on-screen display of the information.)